

MAY 22 1943

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 22

May 10, 1943

WHOLE NO. 973

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON TRAGEDY

Sophocles' View of the Oedipus Coloneus (*Couch*); Note on the Dialogus of Tacitus; On Seneca's Tragedies (*Haywood*); "Honoratus Achilles" in Roman Tragedy (*Korfmacher*); Greek Tragedy — Is It Modern? (*Westbrook*); Thespis' Wagons and Early Opera (*Miller*); "Homo ex Machina" in Sophocles (*Robertson*); Tragedy Swamps Character — — (*Burke*)

REVIEWS

Ross, Student's Oxford Aristotle (*Pritchard*); DE LACY, DE LACY, Philodemus: On Methods of Inference (*Tait*)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

ULLMAN AND HENRY LATIN FOR AMERICANS

BOOK ONE

For First Year

BOOK TWO

For Second Year

The **new** ULLMAN AND HENRY series brings the latest approved materials and methods to the modern study of Latin. Emphasis throughout is on origins of the American way of life. Excellent pictures in full color and black and white.

Book One—\$1.84

Book Two—\$2.40

(list prices quoted, subject to usual school discount)

The Macmillan Company

New York : Boston : Chicago
Dallas : Atlanta : San Francisco

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell. Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON TRAGEDY

Sophocles' View of the Oedipus Coloneus

At the risk of committing a *petitio principii* let it be stated that the theme of the Oedipus Coloneus is the triumph of human dignity over every external circumstance—tribulation and joy, misfortune and magnanimity alike. To understand the point of view of Sophocles himself and the reasons which led him to this particular topic, we must try to grasp at least two things: first, the relationship between the Oedipus Tyrannus and the Oedipus Coloneus, and second, the intellectual and philosophical atmosphere of Athens at the close of the fifth century when the latter play was written.

It is clear that Oedipus has not been introduced into the Oedipus Coloneus solely for the purpose of rounding out a story that was left incomplete in the Oedipus Tyrannus. Sophocles does not seek consistency of characterization from play to play as does Shakespeare. Both the Oedipus Tyrannus and the Oedipus Coloneus are dominated by the character of Oedipus, but they are not dependent one upon the other. Each in its own and distinctive way fulfills the function of tragedy. The former play follows the more orthodox pattern since it tells of a hero falling from prosperity to misery; the latter carries the king from the depths of human wretchedness to a divine destiny that is too sacred for human participation. To a Greek no work of nature was more admirable than man, and each play depends for its message on the nobility of man's character in adversity.

What then is the significance of the external circumstances of the city when the Oedipus Coloneus was written? The tragedy belongs to the closing days of Sophocles' life in 406 B.C.¹ Aeschylus had been dead for a full half-century; Euripides was 74 years of age, and Sophocles himself was ninety. There were no comparable successors in sight to carry on the tragic tradition, as Aristophanes was to make clear when he pre-

sented the Frogs in 405, after the death of both Sophocles and Euripides. The unorthodox Euripides had already departed far from accepted paths of composition and thought, and tragedy as the finest vehicle for philosophic and moral speculation was fast disappearing.

Before attempting to state the view of Sophocles regarding the play, let us take a brief excursus into the fourth Christian century by way of illustration. In the Christian Church of Africa a body of vociferous schismatics called the Donatists had arisen. They became violently abusive of their opponents, who were alleged to have acted in a cowardly manner under the persecutions of Diocletian and thus to have forfeited their right to administer the sacraments.² The controversy raged in the language of theology and many of the accusations were dictated by folly. But those who lifted up their voices were not foolish, for they were using the only mode of expression known to them, the language of theological disputation, to express their misery at the impending economic collapse of the Roman Empire. They had no language or vocabulary of economics, so they talked theological nonsense to express political and economic truth.

What has all this to do with Sophocles and the Oedipus Coloneus? Just this: Sophocles at the end of his long life, with the matured philosophy of the fifth century behind him and conscious that tragedy as an art would soon disappear, used the only language and vocabulary that he knew, that of the tragic theater, to add certain last words on a theme for which no system of argumentation had yet been evolved.

When Sophocles won his first victory over Aeschylus in 468 B.C., Socrates was crawling as an infant in the home of an Athenian stonecutter; a few short years after the composition of the Oedipus Coloneus that same Socrates at the age of seventy was to drink the poison hemlock. It is something of the tremendous philosophic upheaval that marked the years of Socrates'

²See Rebecca West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon* (1941), Vol. I 8-9, for a statement of this schism and for a cogent evaluation of its significance.

¹The year 411 B.C. has been suggested for the composition of the tragedy though ancient testimony says that it was produced posthumously in 402 B.C. by the grandson of Sophocles. See W. N. Bates, *Sophocles* (1940), 59 and n. 5.

maturity that one must grasp if he is to understand the thoughts that agitated the mind of Sophocles. The spirit of prophecy of which Socrates spoke at his trial, and the doctrine of moral responsibility which was inseparable from the growth of humanism were current themes. Thus Sophocles, returning to the tale of Oedipus, presents almost a Christian concept of judgment for which no Christian vocabulary is available. He rethinks the problem of sin in the life of Oedipus. In the Oedipus Tyrannus the king seeks no pardon, only exile, when his deeds have been made manifest, but in the Oedipus Coloneus he passionately argues for the forgiveness that should be granted to his unwitting conduct. The quick understanding of Theseus indicates a new concept that Sophocles is trying to express.

One must take heed lest he carry this notion too far. Sophocles probably had modified his original view of guilt, but it is not necessary to think that he had altered his conviction that, guilty or innocent in soul, a man must inevitably suffer the consequences of his mistake. He is living at a stage of Greek theological development at which it had become evident that the innocent all too often suffer while the guilty go unpunished. Moral philosophy demanded an examination, if not a reconciliation, of such inequity, and Sophocles found it, as a Greek of the fifth century had to find it, in the dignity of the human soul rising supreme against the ephemeral joys and sorrows of life. The Oedipus Coloneus is a corollary of the Oedipus Tyrannus, not a recantation of the earlier views. The vocabulary is necessarily that of tragedy, but the theme is one that was to await another vehicle for its adequate development.

H. N. COUCH

BROWN UNIVERSITY

A Note on the Dialogus of Tacitus

A few years ago Tenney Frank published a very interesting explanation of Curiatius Maternus' defense of his tragedies in Tacitus' Dialogus (AJP 58 [1933] 225-9). Maternus explained that by his Domitius he had broken the power of Nero's evil favorite Vatinius. Frank suggested that the play was about the struggle between L. Domitius and Vatinius in the decade of the 50's B.C., and shows how that Vatinius was like Nero's favorite in many respects, so that Maternus was able to make pointed though indirect allusions which led to the downfall of the evil favorite. Maternus' Cato, which was recited in 74 or 75, is conjectured by Frank to have been aimed at the relegation of Helvidius Priscus, the great admirer of Cato of Utica, a very plausible conjecture.

The purpose of this note is to conjecture what Maternus may have intended with his Medea and Thyestes. Frank suggested that, since Thyestes was the type of the tyrant, the play was written in anticipation

of the tyranny that would follow the banishment of Helvidius Priscus. There seems to me to be a much more likely explanation. Frank probably thought of Thyestes as the tyrant because of his remarks about the powers of kings in Seneca's Thyestes, a part of the play which does not contain its essence. The essence of that play is the struggle between the two brothers. It should be remembered that Vespasian intended that his two sons should succeed him and that his expressed intention was resented by the Senate. If Suetonius is to be trusted, Domitian showed rather early that he was jealous of Titus and disposed to make trouble. It is more likely, then, that Maternus' purpose in his Thyestes was to give a vivid representation of the unfortunate results of having two brothers struggling for the throne, with the hope that Vespasian's intention might thereby be changed.

It is possible to conjecture the purpose of the Medea as well. We know that Titus was deeply enamored of the Jewish princess Berenice, even to the point of wishing to marry her. The idea of such a marriage with a foreigner, and especially with one of a race regarded as mysterious and outlandish in its religious ideas, must have been highly repugnant to the Romans. As a matter of fact, Titus finally gave her up. It may well be, then, if we follow the same line of reasoning, that Maternus hoped to represent vividly what might result from the introduction into the body politic of a foreign princess who was of a somewhat exotic and unpredictable nature.

On Seneca's Tragedies

This is a plea for the more exact use of the words rhetoric and rhetorical in the criticism of Seneca's tragedies. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes once remarked that certain words need to be depolarized, since they have come to vibrate in only one plane, as polarized light does. Rhetoric is such a word, because nowadays it seems to vibrate in only the plane called 'empty' rhetoric, if I may be allowed the figure.

We have somehow come to feel that the word implies emptiness and insincerity of language. It really means increasing the effectiveness of language by certain devices which the Greeks reduced to rule. To take an example still fresh in memory, the sophisticated and attentive hearer of President Roosevelt's speeches in the period just before the war must remember that many of his most powerful effects were gained by the use of rhetorical devices. The same is true of Mr. Churchill's speeches. In the same period their devices were sometimes so unskillfully used by other speakers as to be laughable. These many speakers were not aiming at a display of learning. They were all in earnest and attempting to persuade their hearers, and they all used rhetoric.

Now everyone knows that Seneca employed the devices of rhetoric in great profusion in his tragedies. I should like to offer a number of brief suggestions on this topic. First, it is not true that the devices of rhetoric are appropriate only to oratory. It would be difficult to find a poet who does not use them. We need a more accurate idea of how rhetorical Seneca's tragedies are. H. V. Canter's *Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. X, No. 1, Urbana 1925) is a complete description of the rhetorical devices in the tragedies. Why would it not be possible to set a flock of doctors to making similar studies of the important authors could be definitely established? It might even turn out that Seneca is not so prominently rhetorical as has been supposed.

Second, it seems to be the fashion to attempt to score points off Seneca instead of describing him exactly. If it is the right of the critic to assign to an author a rank in a literary hierarchy, it is also the critic's duty to base that evaluation on a thorough description of the author's qualities. Seneca is not to be damned offhand for his profusion of rhetorical devices. All too often the occurrence of the word rhetorical in Senecan criticism raises the suspicion that the critic has pounced upon the opportunity to score a point off Seneca by charging him with something generally regarded as reprehensible.

The third point is the corollary of the second. These rhetorical devices need careful examination and a consideration of the effectiveness of each. Further, it must be remembered that to label a passage (and correctly) as rhetorical is not a complete condemnation. For example, the debate between Pyrrhus and Agamemnon in the *Troades* is a highly rhetorical passage. It contributes little to the advancement of the play, and there is a temptation to label it a rhetorical insertion. It may fairly be called rhetorical and it may fairly be called an insertion, but this neat tag obscures (1) the effectiveness of the rhetoric, (2) the interesting contrast of character between the two men, and (3) the fact that this is not an isolated case, for Seneca occasionally elsewhere expanded for the sake of interesting characterization, as in the quarrel between Aegisthus and Clytemnestra in the *Agamemnon*. Another instance of good rhetoric is the thematic repetition of the words that help in the unfolding of a leading idea, *bella* in the *Hercules* and *scelera* in the *Medea*.

The fourth suggestion is that we should hesitate to repeat the commonplace that the arrival of the imperial system was responsible for a great increase in rhetoric. This statement is tendentious and has never been proved. I hope presently to be able to offer this objection on a full scale. If Seneca uses more rhetorical

devices than his predecessors, we are safer in regarding it as a reaction against the Augustan style and an attempt to innovate rather than as a result of living under the Empire.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

"Honoratus Achilles" in Roman Tragedy

... Honoratum si forte reponis Achillem,
Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.
Iura neget sibi nata, nihil non adroget armis.

These words of Horace (*Ars Poetica* 120-2) advise the aspiring tragedian of his day to observe the tradition and the type in any attempted portrayal of tragic characters; the lines immediately following enforce the precept by citing the examples (123-4) of *Medea*, *Ino*, *Ixion*, *Io* and *Orestes*. Horace has in mind, of course, the Achilles of Homer¹ and the Greek tragedians, in whom the personality of the warrior before Troy was finally fashioned and established.

However, despite Horace's coldness to Republican tragedy at Rome, it is interesting to observe that the fragments² indicate a careful adherence to the conventional Achilles-type on the part of the Roman tragedians. For example, the thought of verse 122 of the *Ars Poetica* is strikingly anticipated by the words of Priam to Achilles in the *Hectoris Lytra* (*Scenica* 188-9):

Melius est virtute ius: nam saepe virtutem mali
Nanciscuntur: ius atque accum se a malis spernit procul.³

Here *ius* is 'right' and *virtutem* 'might' or 'manly strength';⁴ the aged monarch, as a suppliant, is appealing to the young warrior not to be *inexorabilis*, *acer* in answer to the plea for the ransoming of the body of Hector.

The same tradition of ruthlessness and fierceness⁵ is seen in two further Roman fragments, from the *Alexander* and the *Andromacha Aechmalotis*, respectively (*Scenica* 72-5 and 100-1). In the first, Cassandra fore-

¹The comment of Pseudoacron (recens. Otto Keller, Leipzig 1904, vol. 2) on verse 120 includes the following: Si ergo Achillem, de quo semel Homerus scripsit, velis scribere, debes talem facere qualem Homerus ostendit; and Morris, *Horace: the Epistles*, New York 1911, has: *honoratum* i.e., as the great hero of the Iliad, with the characteristics which belong to him in tradition.

²For the interpretation of the fragments I am indebted largely to Otto Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik* (Leipzig 1875), and to E. H. Warmington's versions of the plays, with comment, in the Loeb Classical Library (*Remains of Old Latin*, vols. 1 and 2, Cambridge 1935-6).

³The fragments of Ennius are cited from Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*,³ Leipzig 1928; those of Accius from Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*,³ Leipzig 1897.

⁴However, Warmington's version (*Remains of Old Latin* 1.291) for *virtutem* is merely 'bravery.'

⁵H. R. Fairclough's Loeb Classical Library translation (*Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, London 1926) renders *impiger*, *iracundus*, *inexorabilis*, *acer* 'impatient, passionate, ruthless, fierce.'

sees the dragging of Hector's body; "O lux Troiae, germane Hector. Quid ita cum tuo lacerato corpore Miser es, aut qui te sic respectantibus Tractavere nobis?" In the second, Andromacha reports the mangling of his remains: "Vidi, videre quod me passa aegurume, Hectorem curru quadriiugo raptarier." In a fragment of the Achilles of Accius (Tragica 2), a warning seems to be spoken to him not to be *iracundus*: "Ne tum cum fervat pectus iracundiae . . ."; and again in the Achilles Aristarchi of Ennius (Scenica 7-9) the aged Phoenix reminds him of the opposing consequences of an evil and a good life:

. . . Summam tu tibi pro mala
Vita famam extolles et pro bona paratam gloriam.
Male volentes famam tollunt, bene volentes gloriam.

There is a suggestion of the same *iracundia* in his oath in the same play (Scenica 10-1): ". . . Per ego deum sublimas subiices Umidas, unde oritur imber sonitu saevo et spiritu"; and in his address to his arms in the Hectoris Lytra (Scenica 178), and its apparent grim pun on two senses of *hostire*, 'to strike' and 'to strike a balance': "Quae mea comminus machaera atque hasta hostibitis manu." A crowning act of his wrathfulness and ferocity is his demand, after death, for a ritualistic wedding to Polyxena as a human sacrifice at his tomb; in Ennius' Andromacha Aechmalotis (Scenica 107-10) the Trojan maiden voices her greeting before the stroke to the world below: "Acherusia templa alta Orci Salvete infera Pallida leti nubila tenebris Loca . . ."

That he is impatient and passionate (*impiger, iracundus*) appears in additional passages. The Achilles of Accius represents the hero⁶ as putting the fretful objection (Tragica 1): "Qua re alia ex crimine inimicorum effugere possis, delica"; and in Ennius' Achilles Aristarchi he forthrightly brushes aside all pretense (Scenica 12): "Eo ego ingenio natus sum: amicitiam atque inimicitiam in frontem promptam gero." In the same writer's Iphigenia (Scenica 242-4) he brushes aside the art of the astrologer: "Astrologorum signa in caelo quid fit observationis Cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod beluarum. Quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas." He is impatient with Ajax in Accius' Myrmidones (Tragica 13-4) because Ajax had not supported him in his feud with Agamemnon: "Quodsi, ut decuit, stares mecum aut meus te maestaret dolor, Iam diu inflammari Atridae navis vidissent suas." The same play shows him stubbornly sure of his own ground (Tragica 17): "Ego me non pecasse plane ostendam aut poenas sufferam"; and confident that he is not marked by stubbornness, *pertinacia*, but by firmness, *pervicacia* (Tragica 4-5): "Tu pertinaciam esse, Antiloche, hanc praedicas, Ego pervicaciam aio et ea me uti volo."

It is interesting too that the *pietas erga deos* which

so definitely marks the Homeric Achilles is reflected in Ennius' Hectoris Lytra (Scenica 177), where the hero prays for success upon the venture of Patroclus against the Trojan forces: "At ego, omnipotens, te exposco ut hoc consilium Achivis auxilio fuat."

CHARLES WILLIAM KORFMACHER

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Greek Tragedy—Is It Modern?

The present use of Greek tragedy in translation in many college and adult education programs does something to compensate for the lessening in the study of these plays in the original Greek; in such programs great stress seems to be placed upon the universality of this drama, its continuing appeal, its modernity. It is certainly a necessary half of education to discover that all men are brothers and that their great works may show similar comprehensions; but the completing part of an education is to discover that no two brothers are exactly alike, and that there is special pleasure in appreciating their distinctions.

Greek tragedy is very Greek as well as universal; part of its individuality lay in its way of presentation—a difficult thing to revive when little is known about Greek dance and music and costume; but the absence of realistic props, the scant use of even suggestive scenery, and the effect of choreography in creating a fluid setting—these things must be pondered before a Greek tragedy can be read intelligently; even the modern theater's recent use of curtains and lighting to give psychologically correct backdrops instead of static furnished sets cannot give the effect of chorus movements, which by rhythm and pantomime kept pace with the words of the actors and were both background and extension of the dialogue. The songs of the Greek chorus are difficult to translate and difficult to read even in the original because they are meant to be seen as well as heard and part of their nature is lost when only the words are considered. The modern reader who "just leaves them out" is missing a vital part of a play, but the reader who tries to appreciate them can gain only a partial and really tantalizing idea of the original values; chorus songs which are merely lyrics, interludes rather than interpretations of the play, come over best; but many a Greek choral song must remain an incomplete experience.

There is also the concentration of plot and passions; although there is not in Greek tragedy such unity of time as Aristotle has led many to postulate, a Greek play is usually conceived as a single point of tension in the lives of a small number of characters; this limited time is often matched by limitation of mood; the characters present only the parts of their natures which are called forth by the crisis in which they are caught. The modern reader who likes to see complete personalities may easily waste attention in a futile effort to

⁶Warmington, however (2.326-7), assigns the fragment to Patroclus.

round out a character and may not be able to lose himself in the terrific force of a single impulse. Selection, concentration and emphasis are the way of art everywhere but never more so than in Greek tragedy; they mark the difference between art and the surface of life; it may take some pains to show that they reveal the depths of life, that the isolation of a character within a single mood reflects the isolation which suffering in life actually creates, that in life as well as in the theater the sufferer's participation in normal events is superficial and that suffering isolates a person on islands of lonely pain.

Between fifth-century tragedy and the modern world, Plato and Christianity have intervened and have turned men inward upon themselves; to these later days, Greek tragedy may seem to stress circumstance rather than inner struggle and the soul's failures and triumphs. It has been asked whether a tragedy of circumstances is possible for a Christian; must not tragedy for him lie solely in the disintegration of the soul? Of course, Greek tragedy does not forget the inner man, and tragedies have been written in Christian countries on the loss of outward prosperity; yet Greek tragedies reflect a world in which loss of station is important, and both fearful and pathetic; the audience is often shown the fall and left to imagine the concomitant spiritual confusion; and how much spiritual confusion one should imagine is a nice and not an easy question; for, in spite of a few indications that the Greek dramatists connected suffering and subsequent self-knowledge, the fallen hero in their tragedies does not always awaken to a realization of what has happened to him; or, if he does, he may feel a particular sense of disgrace which seems odd to later days with other ethical concepts. The feeling of utter defeat, of resourceless misery, which comes at the end of some Greek tragedies makes one see the difference between a drama of outward failure and one concerned with inner collapse. This outward look is one thing that makes plot so important; for it is man in action and not man in reverie that delighted the Greek audience until Euripides taught them to love verbosity, and failure for a man of action is likely to lie in the failure of his acts; the consequent loss of prestige and esteem is in itself adequate tragedy. The cleansing of the heart may or may not follow; but, whether it does or not, it is seldom made the central theme of the play.

There are many other peculiarly Greek facets to Greek drama: religious backgrounds and survivals; the vocabularies and verse forms of the original plays; the great variety of skills which each of the dramatists shows in spite of the seeming singleness of genius which Aristotle's simplification of the drama has contributed to our handbooks; the use of historical or legendary rather than contemporary plot. Attention is drawn to these because thought for these things may

help us to preserve the integrity of the Greek theater and to flavor its universal appeal with its special discernments and techniques.

H. THEODRIC WESTBROOK

SCRIPPS COLLEGE

Thespis' Wagons and Early Opera

In the history of the beginnings of opera in Italy there is an interesting parallel to the tradition¹ recorded by Horace in *De Arte Poetica* that

Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse Camoenæ
dicitur et plaustri vexisse poemata Thespis
quæ canerent agerentque peruncti faecibus ora (275-7).

This parallel occurs in a short discorso entitled *Della Musica dell'Eta Nostra* by the famous Italian traveler to the Orient, Pietro della Valle (1586-1652) when he writes:²

E nella Musica del mio Carro composta dal medesimo Quagliati in camera mia, la maggior parte, secondo che vedeva a me dar gusto, con la quale uscii in maschera il Carnevale dell'Anno 1606, e fu una delle prime azioni; (per dir così) rappresentate in Musica, che in Roma si siano sentite; benchè non v'intervenissero più che cinque voci, e cinque instrumenti quanti a punto in un Carro camminante potevano aver luogo.

Della Valle records³ that during the Carnival of 1606 in Rome several masked actors, of whom he himself was one, had put on in a wagon a play, set to music by the composer Quagliati. He rightly claims that it was one of the first *azioni* represented in music in Rome. This coincidence is especially striking when one remembers that at the house of Giovanni Bardi, Conte de Vernio, in Florence in the year 1600, Peri and other musicians and men of letters had collaborated in an avowed attempt to resuscitate the ancient Greek drama, an experiment which failed in its immediate purpose but culminated ultimately in the creation of modern opera.

HAROLD W. MILLER

FURMAN UNIVERSITY

The "Homo ex Machina" in Sophocles

I propose to use the term "homo ex machina" simply as a convenient way of designating a human character used by the dramatist in some striking fashion to aid in bringing the play to a satisfactory conclusion. It may be characteristic of Sophocles' interest in humanity

¹The interpretation of this passage is of course a matter of controversy.

²This discorso (written in 1640) is printed with the collected works of della Valle's friend, Giovanni Battista Doni (1593-1647) entitled *Lyra Barberina*, whose works were collected and published in Florence in 1763. Doni, who had an exhaustive knowledge of ancient music, wrote three treatises describing the music and musical instruments of the ancients.

³Vol. 2, 252. Della Valle was at this time studying music and, doubtless, Greek.

rather than in theological problems that he does not use gods for this purpose, unless we so regard the use of a deified hero in the *Philoctetes*.

In Sophocles' plays some difficult questions are raised, touching problems of right and wrong or problems of suffering and evil. It is often difficult to assess the right and wrong or to accept the suffering. The result may be an impasse or a feeling of bewilderment and frustration, and consequently it is the aim of the poet to reach some reconciliation or at least to bring about an appeasement of emotion and final harmony. To produce this result Sophocles frequently has recourse to a character who appears as the personification of wisdom and pious moderation, who sees the problems of the play in the proper light, who speaks as one with authority and declares what is right or what is to be done. This character may or may not have had a prominent part in the earlier action and we may or may not have been prepared for his rôle as a "homo ex machina."

In the *Ajax* the central issue is the right appraisal of the merits of the hero. Are we to be influenced more by his previous achievements and his truly heroic stature as revealed in his speeches or by his murderous attempts at private revenge? The prudent and magnanimous counsels of Odysseus give the answer.

In the *Antigone* the dramatic conflict is based upon two related questions. Is Creon justified in refusing burial to the traitor Polyneices? Is Antigone justified in breaking Creon's edict in obedience to what she regards as a higher law? Critics differ with regard to the validity of Creon's position but it is at least arguable that Sophocles has taken pains to present his case in a not unfavorable light in order to develop a dramatic conflict. The chorus is obviously perplexed until Teiresias appears to settle the problem and to prevent the action from ending by a mere use of force. Teiresias' status as a seer admirably fits him for the rôle of "homo ex machina."

The *Electra* is essentially a drama of heroism. Electra's heroic resolve meets with opposition in the outspoken hostility of Clytaemnestra and the prudential considerations urged by Chrysothemis. But for Orestes she would have been frustrated and the action would have ended in an impasse. He is thus a "homo ex machina" in that he becomes the pivot of events, although he does not exhibit the same authoritative characteristics as his counterparts in other plays.

A more typical instance is found in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* where Creon brings the play to a satisfactory conclusion. He takes command of the situation and by a combination of firmness and tactful sympathy changes the passionate grief of Oedipus to a calmer sorrow.

The *Trachiniae* ends in an unsatisfactory manner and this is in part due to the absence of a "homo ex machina." Hyllus essays to play the part, but is over-

borne by his half-crazed father and submits perforce to his dying commands. Had he been able to assert himself, he might have brought about a reconciliation.

In the *Philoctetes* Heracles is introduced to break the deadlock which the action has reached. In a sense he is a typical *deus ex machina*, but at the same time he has much in common with his human counterparts in other plays. It is significant that he declares the will of Zeus rather than his own. Further, his prestige is derived from his earthly career and his human attributes rather than from his recently acquired divinity. He may be regarded as a "homo ex machina" who happens to have been deified.

The action of the *Oedipus Coloneus* consists of a series of incidents in which Theseus more than once ends the dilemma in which the chorus find themselves when their fear of the gods and their pity for a suppliant conflict. It is a situation requiring some authoritative judgment such as Theseus gives. In the Creon scene Theseus appears as the ruler who upholds justice and saves the situation. In the Polyneices scene he remains for a time in the background, since there is no reconciliation of the conflict of Oedipus and his son. In the scene of the passing of Oedipus, Theseus is given a secondary rôle when he is made the repository of Oedipus' secret, but in the final scene he has a foremost part. Antigone expresses a passionate desire to see her father's tomb, though Ismene tells her that it may not be. Theseus appears and with mingled firmness and kindness tells her that her wish is impossible. Antigone acquiesces and thus the play is brought to a quiet close. The use of Theseus here is a slight touch, but is thoroughly characteristic of the poet's methods.

Sophocles is too great an artist to repeat a pattern with mechanical regularity and it would be surprising if he used a stock character like the "homo ex machina" in the same way or to the same extent in all his plays. But the frequent use is evidence that he considered the rôle to be of value in his dramatic economy. The two essentials of the "homo ex machina" appear to be his decisive function in the structure of the play and his authority based on wisdom.

H. G. ROBERTSON

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Tragedy Swamps Character — —

In a very penetrating and decisive sentence W. B. Yeats has said that tragedy swamps character while comedy consists in character. This view is indeed very illuminating and serves to 'point' much that all have experienced in reading and studying literature and in watching dramatic performances; it especially rings true when applied to Greek literature and drama. We might say that the tragic writers know and reveal their characters as 'human souls,' while the comic writers know and reveal theirs as 'individuals.' In the midst of a great

tragic action these small individual characteristics which are the special delight of tragedy are lost from sight and our minds and emotions play upon those great motives and thoughts which are far from individual and are more nearly universal. This view of tragedy explains the sentiment about Greek tragedy which is often expressed, namely that the Greeks were more concerned with action than with character. But of course I would not care to press the generalization far enough to distort the truth for, as Oliver Wendell Holmes once said (and as almost everyone else since then has said), "No generalization is ever entirely true, and neither is this one."

But the more this view of tragedy is examined, the more true and revealing it appears. When we think of Shakespeare's plays Jacques and Bottom and Falstaff leap out as vivid, distinct, highly individual characters. But with Hamlet, Lear or Macbeth it is more the strong individual notes in them that impress. They are not so vivid as individuals as the comic characters; the typical in them predominates: the keen intellect, troubled with doubt; the tragedy of lordly fatherhood, outraged and deserted; the powerful impact of an ambition too great.

A man like Dante deals with the great and heroic emotions which are common to all men and which certainly overwhelm the little traits and peculiarities that make for the comic character. The cry of the father who is in the Tower of Hunger, or the poignant story of Francesca da Rimini can impress us more as the cry of fatherhood than as the cry of a particular father and as the story of a tragic love than as the story of a tragic lover. But in a writer like Chaucer we meet a great many who delight precisely because they are so many particular people in so many particular, amusing circumstances. Clear and sharp in our minds is the Widow of Bath with her bright red stockings, or the nun who even blew her nose delicately. And the franklin who is grumbling over the behavior of his son is always a particular father grumbling over one particular son in a set of highly amusing and particular circumstances. Chaucer's characters always remain in our minds as very definite people, even more definite perhaps than the little old lady across the street who is caring for window boxes and primroses, or the garrulous old fellow at the corner store with his inevitable pipe. For Chaucer is speaking with the individual voice of comedy, whereas Dante speaks in the mighty tragic tone, or we might say the typical tone, which is more the voice of man than of a man.

An example from contemporary literature that springs to my mind is Eugene O'Neill's *Days Without End*. In his drama we are constantly impressed with the fact that for any modern man who thinks, there are only two alternatives, suicide or the Catholic Church. In the sweep of the play, John Loving, the main character, becomes more the typical modern man than a

particular man. The little individuating notes are swamped or overwhelmed in the midst of the powerful dramatic action. The same is true of Masefield's *Dauber*. This is the tale of a tragic sea voyage and of a dreamer who wanted to be a painter. A short distance from port this character, Dauber, is killed in a fall to the deck from a snapped mast, but in his death we feel that he has proved himself a strong, noble soul. But in the rush of the poem and its vivid portrayal of that theme of victory in defeat, so common in Masefield's writing, we feel that it is the story and the struggle of a character more as a human soul that we are watching and reacting to than the story of a character as an individual. But in Molière's comedies we know that we are always dealing with very particular and individual characters; a man like Monsieur Jourdain from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* is always a very definite character. The emphasis is always on the individuating traits, rather than on the universal traits as in tragedy.

Chesterton has remarked that, although the Greek poets, especially the epic poets like Homer, have a fine feeling for character, still their ultimate motive is a true movement towards a crisis or an act: some turning point which is illustrative of the fate of man or the will of god. Hector is a character who appeals to many modern readers, but Homer is not concerned so directly with the character of Hector as he is with the death and doom of Hector, for in the death of Hector is the doom of Ilium. "We could not expect," says G. K. "to have Hector talking forever in his tent as we should like to have Falstaff talking forever in his tavern." We might like to wander forever with that fine old scholarly and very polite gentleman Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, or with Mr. Pickwick or Sam Weller, but we would feel strange and out of place to be wandering with an Odysseus who never returned to Penelope and his home, or with a Trojan hero who never got to Rome.

And this same emphasis on action or the universal as opposed to the same emphasis on the particular or the individual character explains much that we have often heard expressed about Greek tragedy and the greater stress the Greeks laid upon action than upon character. The interest was centered on the universal bearing of certain acts and situations, or the light which the experience represented threw on the whole tendency and course of human life, not on the sentiments and motives of the personages introduced. The general point of view predominates over the idiosyncrasies of particular persons. Human nature as a whole is represented. But I think that this is due to the fact that all great tragedy, even though it have very strong characters, will tend to throw the interest of the spectator upon the universal rather than upon the particular. The character will be overwhelmed in the midst of the great tragic action, whereas in the good comedy it is the particular person who gets the emphasis. Man is

the subject of Greek tragedy; Joe or Charlie of a comedy. This is very evident in the powerful Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles, where we lose sight of the individual traits of Oedipus because we are gripped with the great tale and portrayal of the tragedy that may occur when human knowledge is put in opposition to divine knowledge. In the Prometheus Bound of

Aeschylus we soon lose sight of the particular character in the feeling that this is a typical human soul that we are seeing in its suffering for sin. The general overwhelms the particular; the tragic swamps the character.

THOMAS J. M. BURKE

WESTON COLLEGE

REVIEWS

The Student's Oxford Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross. 6 volumes. I Logic xix, 331 pages; II Natural Philosophy iii, 495 pages; III Psychology iii, 245 pages; IV Metaphysics iii, 322 pages; V Ethics iii, 241 pages; VI Politics and Poetics iii, 348 pages. Oxford University Press, New York 1942 \$7.50 (I \$1.50; II \$2; III \$1; IV \$1; V \$1; VI \$1.50)

One would "lever have at his beddes heed" this reprint "of Aristotle and his philosophye" than many a new work "arida modo pumice expolitum." The Oxford translation was within the purchasing power of few scholars; many of the smaller colleges did not buy it for their libraries; but here, at a modest outlay, one may furnish himself with a generous selection from the works of Aristotle. Volume One contains the Categoriæ, De Interpretatione, Analytica Priora, and Analytica Posteriora; Volume Two, the Physica, De Caelo, and De Generatione et Corruptione; Volume Three, De Anima and Parva Naturalia; Volume Four, the Metaphysica; Volume Five, the Ethica Nicomachea; and Volume Six, the Politica and De Poetica. These works are all printed in full. Each volume may also be purchased separately. The Preface advises the reader, however, that the selection was so made as to include works of Aristotle which are "of decisive importance for the understanding of his philosophy." One who has only moderate knowledge of Aristotle's thought will recognize at a glance that the mastery of the logical treatises in Volume One is prerequisite to the study of the later volumes. It is moreover a commonplace among students of Aristotle that one must know Aristotle's work in many fields if he is to gain good understanding of any one. Of course, no selection from an author's works, no matter what the principle upon which it has been made, is likely to satisfy everybody. In this collection, the student interested in either the Ethics or Poetics will miss the Rhetoric, with its information complementary to both, and will perhaps wonder why the work treating of a matter of such vital moment in Aristotle's world, should not be considered of fundamental importance to the better understanding of Aristotle. Be this as it may, to complain greatly of an omission when so much is offered is almost to look a gift horse in the teeth.

Inasmuch as this is a reprint of an earlier edition, it

is hardly necessary to enter once more upon detailed criticism of the translations. One is surprised to find no mention made of the individual translators who worked under the direction of Sir David Ross. Without this information, the more numerous readers whom this cheaper edition may reasonably expect to reach, who are in many cases unacquainted with the earlier edition, will no doubt be startled at the inevitable unevenness of the translations. While it is true that some of the translators are little known to many Americans, surely the names of Mure and Bywater would add lustre to this series. It would be an improvement also to make uniform the spelling of the Greek proper names. In two successive works, De Caelo and De Generatione, the former Latinizes the Greek names, while the latter does not. A few instances of questionable expression also occur. In De Anima 403a 25, the reader is assured that "the affections of the soul are enmattered formulable essences," a clause nearly as bewildering to the modern reader as is the original Greek. The term "enmattered" does not appear in the New English Dictionary, nor in Webster, nor in Funk and Wagnalls. "Formulable," though listed in Webster, is not in the New English Dictionary. Competent authority has restricted the coinage of new words to poets, and even to them it is "licentia sumpta pudenter." It should perhaps be gratifying to an American to find an English scholar preferring the authority of Webster to the New English Dictionary. The Greek clause, *δηλον ὅτι τὰ πάθη λόγοι ἐνλοοί εἰσιν*, is more clearly rendered by Hicks, "the attributes are evidently forms or notions realised in matter." Nor it is quite accurate, in Ethica 1097a 25ff., to use such denominations as "more final" and "most final." Errors of this sort Aristotle no doubt would classify as adventitious and therefore venial; yet he insists that the author ought really to make no mistakes at all.

A third passage is deserving of especial notice on account of usage that, to an American at least, is misleading. In Politica 1281b 36-38, our translator renders the words *καθάπερ ἢ μὴ καθαρὰ τροφή μετὰ τῆς καθαρᾶς τὴν πᾶσαν ποιεῖ χρησιμωτέραν τῆς ὀλίγης* by "just as impure food when mixed with what is pure sometimes makes the entire mass more wholesome than a small quantity of the pure would be." Newman, The Politics of Aristotle 3.220-1, remarks (ad loc.) that

"pure" evidently means "unrefined," like entire wheat flour as opposed to white flour, and quotes Athenaeus 109c in support of the rendering.

The text of the translation is accurately printed. I have detected only two printers' errors. In *De Anima* 407b 30, an "l" has dropped out of "public," and in *Politica* 1259b 13, an opening quotation mark is lost. The notes as a whole are helpful to the better understanding of Aristotle's sense, and the emendations, especially in the *Physica* and *De Caelo* are as ingenious as they are plausible. The acute accents and aspirations appear at various angles to the text, and the lines of Greek could not infrequently bear straightening. The few errors in the footnotes, though trivial, ought to be noted. In the *Physica* 191a 13, note 4, for *ὡς* read *ὥς*; in 225a 8, note 5, for *εἰρημένον* read *εἰρημένον*; in 246b 17, note 3, the letter *ε* has dropped out of *θερμότης*; in 255b 1, note 1, for *ποιητικόν* read *ποιητικόν*; in 259a 35, note 4, the accent on *κινημένον* is lacking; in 287b 23, note 1, for "right" read "right," and in 290b 23, note 2, the accent on *στιγμῇ* is missing. In *De Somniis* 248b 28, note 2, the accent on *ὁ* is missing. In *Ethics* 1150a 21, note 3, for *όλαστος* read *ἀκόλαστος*. In *Politica* 1267a 28, note 2, a closing quotation mark is lost; and in 1269a 18, note 4, the numeral for the footnote is omitted.

Volume 1 contains a short introduction written for this edition by Sir David Ross, in which are concisely presented the known facts about Aristotle, with a brief summary of his complete works. There is also a bibliography under six headings of some 120 titles.

The slight strictures passed upon this reprint of Aristotle are but the wounds of a friend. This timely publication of Aristotle's calm, unbiased, rational pursuit after facts will, it may be hoped, disseminate more widely a point of view never more tragically absent from the world. But the six attractive volumes are at the same time a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ* for which the scholarly world will be grateful. Sir David Ross and the Oxford University Press are to be congratulated upon the product of their labors.

JOHN PAUL PRITCHARD

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

Philodemus: On Methods of Inference. A Study in Ancient Empiricism. Edited, with Translation and Commentary by PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY and ESTELLE ALLEN DE LACY. ix, 200 pages, 1 plate. American Philological Association. Philadelphia 1941 (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, Number X) \$2.50 (\$1.75 to members of the APA)

In their Foreword the editors present briefly a case for Greek empiricism based on the methodology developed by the Epicureans and Sceptics. The traditional

approach to Greek philosophy has ignored empiricism in its concentration upon rationalism. The Epicurean school in particular has always been labeled as having an amusingly naive attitude toward philosophic method and a shortsighted contempt for logic. The long-standing tradition contradicts the evidence to be found in Epicurean writings, and is now in process of revision. Philodemus is the most important source for our knowledge of the development and application of Epicurean empirical method. His treatise *On Methods of Inference* gives the most complete presentation extant of the Epicurean position, and is therefore of unique importance for this task of revising old misconceptions. Although it has been the subject of some study, especially in Germany, the work is almost unknown in this country. The present editors have made a valuable contribution not only in providing a sound and readable Greek and English text, but also in the clear exposition of the subject matter contained in their commentary and supplementary essays.

The treatise belongs to the group of comparatively well preserved Herculanean papyri. Although it is incomplete, most restorations are fairly certain and give a continuous text with few lacunae. Photostats of the Oxford copy formed the basis of this edition. The text, essentially that of Gomperz, adds to it Philippson's improvements, many letters bracketed by both Gomperz and Philippson, and some conjectural restorations of fragmentary passages. The exact title and the approximate date of the treatise are uncertain. This edition retains the commonly accepted title, *Περὶ Σημειώσεων* as a convenient though admittedly incomplete indication of the content. A reference to Antony makes two dates possible, 54 B.C. or 40 B.C., and the editors very reasonably suggest the greater probability of the earlier date since there is no evidence for Philodemus' activity in Italy in 40 B.C.

Like most of Philodemus' philosophical works this was apparently intended as a source-book, probably for the use of members of the school in Naples. As usual he presents not his own theories but those of earlier Epicurean teachers, in this case Zeno, Bromius, and Demetrius, and the same authorities provide the statement of his opponents' position. This method and the typical Epicurean emphasis on refutation make for overlapping and inconsistency of argument, and to meet this difficulty the Introduction includes a detailed outline of content. As it stands the treatise is a defense of the Epicurean use of signs based on sense perception as a foundation of logic against the attacks of the Stoics whose method of inference is a priori and rational. The material is divided into four sections, of which the first two give Stoic arguments against Epicurean method and Epicurean answers, the last two the Epicurean statement of the fundamental errors of the Stoic arguments against Epicurean method.

The translation of the Greek is straightforward and concise. It is the editors' opinion that Philodemus' prose, though "plain and unadorned," on the whole expresses his thought clearly. Certainly, aside from the method of refutation, the technical subject matter and vocabulary are chiefly responsible for obscurity, and English translations of Philodemus underline this fact. An extensive running commentary accompanies the text.

A chapter is devoted to a brief survey of Philodemus' life and works. It might be suggested that the relative importance of Philodemus' and Siro's official connection with the Italian Epicurean movement is not so well defined as the statement of it here seems to assume.

Three chapters review the sources and trace the development of Epicurean empiricism, and set forth the logical controversies among Epicureans, Stoics, and Sceptics. The editors' object has been to treat this material historically without evaluating the philosophical issues involved, and these studies make a valuable and much needed addition to current works on the Hellenistic schools. The consistent and developing use of empirical method by Epicureans is traced from Epi-

curus to Philodemus, and its application to their whole philosophy, especially in Philodemus' works, is convincingly demonstrated. This prolonged controversy about methods of inference freed Greek philosophy from the domination of "absolutistic and deterministic views" and resulted in "a new approach to logic, epistemology, and science." Its importance in the history of empiricism, particularly in the light of the modern empiricists' interest in signs and symbols, is properly underlined by the editors.

Much of the material presented here is highly technical and does not make for easy reading, but the editors have not been guilty of adding to the difficulties inherent in the subject matter. They have contributed to its simplification a direct, compact style, excellent organization, and clear explanatory comment. Both editors and publishers are to be congratulated on the accuracy of the whole and the attractiveness and readability of the volume. Bibliography and index are appended; of particular value is the bibliography of Herculanean papyri and an index of Greek philosophical terms.

MARION TAIT

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Horace. WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER. *Relicta Non Bene Parmula (Horace, Odes, 2.7.10)*. Concludes that the passage is genuinely autobiographical, "that Horace says just what he appears to say, namely, that the army of the Liberators collapsed in the second fight at Philippi . . . and that in the rapid rout that followed Horace, thoroughly scared, ran with the rest and left his shield behind him." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada 36 (1942) 13-4 (Spaeth)

Marius Victorinus. ALBERT H. TRAVIS. *Marius Victorinus: a Biographical Note*. There is evidence to show that the distinguished rhetorician of the fourth century, who was converted to Christianity ca. 355 A.D. in *extrema senectute*, was born ca. 280 and died ca. 363. Previous biographers have either evaded the question or set his birth ca. 300. HThR 36 (1943) 83-90 (Walton)

Plato. F. LA TOUCHE GODFREY. *Plato's Doctrine of Participation*. Parmenides 131-5 interpreted on the hypothesis of objective idealism, of participation of the Ideas in material things and thought; rejection of the theory of two separate worlds, of existence of Ideas apart from particular things, of a transcendent One, in Plato's thought; Hardie's interpretation in terms of Neoplatonic transcendence criticized. Hermathena 59 (1942) 6-19 (Taylor)

Vergil. JOSEPH G. FUCHLA. *Vergil and Antonio Ferreira*. Detailed study of the influence of Vergil's Eclogues upon the imitative pastorals of the sixteenth century Portuguese poet. StPhNC 40 (1943) 14-24 (Spaeth)

ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

Blegen, Elizabeth Pierce. *News Items from Athens*. During the German excavations at Olympia in the winter of 1938/9, pieces of terra-cotta akroterion were found in the artificial fill of the Stadium, where in 1878 had been discovered a bearded head of Zeus. Except for the base, the fragments all fit together. Zeus is represented as striding forward, carrying in his left hand a staff, and under his right arm, the youthful Ganymede. The only major loss is that of the head, feet, and right arm of the youth. This is the first nearly-complete large scale work (total height 1.06 m.) of a Greek artist in clay to be recovered. It dates from about 470 B.C., but cannot be assigned to any known building at Olympia. The well-preserved torso, also in terra cotta, of a warrior, was likewise found in the Stadium. This dates from about 490 B.C., and Kunze assigns its creation to a Corinthian workshop. In the South Colonnade was found a very fine bronze statuette of a horse, a part of a quadriga group. It is work of the Dorian-Peloponnesian School, of about 472 B.C. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 477-87 (Walton)

Bonner, Campbell. *Aeolus Figured on Colic Amulets*. A haematite amulet recently acquired by the University of Michigan is, like the similar amulet published by Eitrem, intended as a protection against colic. Eitrem's interpretation can now be corrected on several points. The human figure represents the wind-god, Aeolus, as the "demon of colic," while the eagle appears as the beneficent, protective power. Ill. HThR 35 (1942) 87-93 (Walton)

Daly, Lloyd W. *Echinos and Justinian's Fortifications in Greece*. Parts of the surviving fortification walls at this site are undoubtedly fourth-century B.C. constructions, but the rest seems to date from the reconstruction by Justinian, recorded by Procopius.

The "emplecton" technique found here is observable also at other sites where fortifications are known to have been rebuilt under Justinian. Ill.
AJA 46 (1942) 500-8 (Walton)

DANIEL, JOHN F. *Social Continuities in Cyprus*. Resemblances between excavated remains of an ancient city of Cyprus and the nearby modern village of Episkopi furnish striking evidence of "a direct continuity in the ethnic and cultural traditions of the village" and thus suggest the importance that modern village life in general assumes for the archaeologist. Scientific Monthly 56 (1943) 78-80 (Spaeth)

INGHOLT, HARALD. *The Danish Excavations at Hama on the Orontes*. A summary of the excavations conducted from 1931 to 1938. Twelve levels, ranging in date from the fifth millennium B.C. to 1400 A.D., were uncovered. A number of the notable finds are mentioned and illustrated. AJA 46 (1942) 469-76 (Walton)

MCDONALD, W. A. *Where Did Nestor Live?* The recent trial excavation at Ano Englianos near Koyphasion in Messenia revealed the remains of an extensive palace and of a number of bee-hive tombs. This once again opens the question of the location of Nestor's Pylos. While final consideration must await further exploration, the Messenian site can no longer be dismissed, and M. here reviews the controversy, and states the grounds for accepting the southern site instead of the Triphylian Pylos as the capital of Nestor's kingdom. AJA 46 (1942) 538-45 (Walton)

Multum in Parvo: An Exhibition of Newly Acquired Engraved Ancient Gems. The Metropolitan Museum of Art has purchased thirty-one gems from the collection of Sir Arthur Evans, and received the collection of over five hundred stones by bequest of William Gedney Beatty. Its collection has now been brought to first rank. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 488-9 (Walton)

SMITH, WILLIAM STEVENSON. *The Origin of Some Unidentified Old Kingdom Reliefs*. The reliefs from many Old Kingdom tombs have been widely dispersed. A number of pieces, belonging to five tombs, are here identified, and partial restorations of the blocks are in some cases suggested. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 509-31 (Walton)

VAN BUREN, A. W. *News Items from Rome*. Hydraulic installations on the Capitoline; new, detailed photographs of the Trajanic and Antonine columns; a sixth-century bucchero vase, found by the Clivus Capitolinus, with an inscription, possibly in Etruscan. Ostia: a well preserved residence with frescoes and mosaics intact; a house with Pompeian-style peristyle, in which is a bidental; the sanctuary of Bona Dea, outside the Porta Marina; a new fragment of the Fasti of Ostia, for the years 14-15 A.D.; portrait statues from the headquarters of the Augustales; a Neo-Attic altar of the Twelve Gods. The Campanari collection of Etruscan antiquities, from Tuscania, acquired for the museum at Tarquinia; a fine architectural terracotta, of Hellenistic date, found by Dr. Andr n in the grounds of the Villa Medici at Rome. A discussion of Maiuri's recent book on the last period of building in Pompeii. The reliefs from the Heraion in Lucania, with scenes from the centauromachy on Mt. Pholoe and the more famous exploits of Herakles, the Oresteia, the Trojan

Cycle, and others, constitutes the richest repertory of myths—apart from the writings of mythographers—transmitted to us from antiquity. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 428-40 (Walton)

VAN BUREN, E. DOUGLAS. *A Collection of Cylinder Seals in the Biblioteca Vaticana*. A description of nine cylinder seals, a Neo-Babylonian stamp seal, and two small amulets from the archaic period of Sumerian art, all part of a collection made by the R. P. Maximilian Rylo about 1838 in Nineveh. The seals vary in date from the Early Dynastic to the Neo-Babylonian periods. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 360-5 (Walton)

EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPYROLOGY

CAPPS, EDWARD. *Greek Inscriptions. A New Fragment of the List of Victors at the City Dionysia*. The piece contains 13 letters of the heading and parts of the upper lines of columns III and IV. From it we learn that Pherekrates won his first victory at the City Dionysia 438/7, and Hermippos his first in 436/5; and we have "two more fixed dates for the interpretation of the Victors' List of the comic poets who won at the City Festival." One plate showing IG ii2, 2318 frgg. a, b, b2, c, d in their relation to one another. Illustrated and indexed. Hesperia 12 (1943) 1-11 (Durham)

DOHAN, EDITH HALL, and HOENIGSWALD, H. M. *Three Inscriptions in the University Museum, Philadelphia*. Three Etruscan inscriptions, all probably of the third century B.C. One is on a bronze strigil; one on a plate belongs to a group of Clusine inscriptions represented by CIE 638 and 4880; the last is a short graffito, in what seems to be a completely Latin alphabet, on a Faliscan vase. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 532-7 (Walton)

IMMERWAHR, H. R. *Five Dedicatory Inscriptions from the North Wall of the Acropolis*. Ill. Hesperia 11 (1942) 338-48 (Durham)

OLIVER, JAMES H. *C. Sulpicius Galba, Proconsul of Achaia*. Since it is now known that the praenomen of Sulpicius Galba, the consul of 5 B.C., is Gaius, he, as well as his father, the historian, and his son, the consul of 22 A.D., are all possible candidates for identification with the man honored on inscriptions of Delphi, Samos, and Athens. It is simplest to assume that the whole group of inscriptions refers to a single man, the proconsul of Achaia. This can only be the historian, since he alone fulfills the qualifications of age and rank in or about 13 B.C., the approximate date of the Delphi inscription. Ill. AJA 46 (1942) 380-8 (Walton)

VANDERPOOL, EUGENE. *An Archaic Inscribed Stele from Marathon*. "The stele . . . contains parts of two inscriptions, one on the front, the other on the back. The first is a legal document dating from the time of the reforms of Kleisthenes which perhaps defines the powers and duties of local courts or judges. The second, which dates from just after the battle of Marathon, records some of the procedure governing the selection of officials for the Herakleian games at Marathon." In the former the lines read vertically downwards instead of horizontally, and three-quarters of each line are missing, so that no complete thought can be read. The second is horizontal, the lines are almost complete, and about a dozen lines can be read. Ill. Hesperia 11 (1942) 329-37 (Durham)